



Unmanned Aircraft Systems Traffic Management (UTM)

SAFELY ENABLING UAS OPERATIONS IN LOW-ALTITUDE AIRSPACE

Dr. Parimal Kopardekar

Senior Technologist Air Transportation System

Principal Investigator, UTM

NASA Ames Research Center

Moffett Field, CA

- Overview
- Architecture
- Approach and schedule
- FAA-NASA Research Transition Team deliverables
- Technical Capability Level 1 (TCL1) Demonstration overview and results
- TCL2 Demonstration overview and results
- Next Steps



Overview

Low Altitude UAS Operations



- Small UAS forecast – 7M total, 2.6M commercial by 2020
- Vehicles are automated and airspace integration is necessary
- New entrants desire access and flexibility for operations
- Current users want to ensure safety and continued access
- Regulators need a way to put structures as needed
- Operational concept being developed to address beyond visual line of sight UAS operations under 400 ft. AGL in uncontrolled airspace using UTM construct

What is UTM?



- UTM is an “air traffic management” ecosystem for uncontrolled airspace
- UTM utilizes industry’s ability to supply services under FAA’s regulatory authority where these services do not exist
- UTM development will ultimately identify services, roles/responsibilities, information architecture, data exchange protocols, software functions, infrastructure, and performance requirements for enabling the management of low-altitude uncontrolled UAS operations

UTM addresses critical gaps associated with lack of support for uncontrolled operations
How to enable multiple BVLOS operations in low-altitude airspace?

Key Operational Assumptions



- FAA maintains regulatory *AND* operational authority for airspace and traffic operations
- UTM is used by FAA to issue directives, constraints, and airspace configurations
- Air traffic controllers **are not required** to actively “control” every UAS in uncontrolled airspace or uncontrolled operations inside controlled airspace
- FAA has on-demand access to airspace users and can maintain situation awareness through UTM
- UTM roles/responsibilities: Regulator, UAS Operator, and UAS Service Supplier (USS)
- FAA Air Traffic can institute operational constraints for safety reasons anytime

Key principle is safely integrate UAS in uncontrolled airspace without burdening current ATM

Principles

- ☐ Users operate in airspace volumes as specified in authorizations, which are issued based on type of operation and operator/vehicle performance
- ☐ UAS stay clear of each other
- ☐ UAS and manned aircraft stay clear of each other
- ☐ UAS operator has complete awareness of airspace and other constraints
- ☐ Public safety UAS have priority over other UAS

Key UAS-related services

- ☐ Authorization/authentication
- ☐ Airspace configuration and static and dynamic geo-fence definitions
- ☐ Track and locate
- ☐ Communications and control (spectrum)
- ☐ Weather and wind prediction and sensing
- ☐ Conflict avoidance (e.g., airspace notification)
- ☐ Demand/capacity management
- ☐ Large-scale contingency management (e.g., GPS or cell outage)

Defining Operator and Regulator/ANSP Roles



UAS Operator

- Assure communication, navigation, and surveillance (CNS) for vehicle
- Register
- Train/qualify to operate
- Avoid other aircraft, terrain, and obstacles
- Comply with airspace constraints
- Avoid incompatible weather

Regulator/Air Navigation Service Provider

- Define and inform airspace constraints
- Facilitate collaboration among UAS operators for de-confliction
- If future demand warrants, provide air traffic management
 - Through near real-time airspace control
 - Through air traffic control integrated with manned aircraft traffic control, where needed

Third-party entities may provide support services but are not separately categorized or regulated

UTM Research and Development



Operations Considerations

- Overarching architecture
- Scheduling and planning
- Dynamic constraints
- Real-time tracking integration
- Weather and wind
- Alerts:
 - Demand/capacity alerts
 - Safety critical events
 - Priority access enabling (public safety)
 - All clear or all land alerts
- Data exchange protocols
- Cyber security
- Connection to FAA systems


Vehicle Considerations

- Low SWAP DAA
- Vehicle tracking: cell, satellite, ADS-B, pseudo-lites
- Reliable control system
- Geo-fencing conformance
- Safe landing
- Cyber secure communications
- Ultra-noise vehicles
- Long endurance
- GPS free/degraded conditions
- Autonomous last/first 50 feet operations



Architecture

UTM Architecture





UTM Approach and Schedule

UTM Progression



Goal:

Safely enabling large scale visual and beyond visual line of sight operations in the low altitude airspace

Risk-based approach along four distinct Technical Capability Levels (TCL)

UTM Technical Capability Levels (TCLs)



CAPABILITY 1: DEMONSTRATED HOW TO ENABLE MULTIPLE OPERATIONS UNDER CONSTRAINTS

- Notification of area of operation
- Over unpopulated land or water
- Minimal general aviation traffic in area
- Contingencies handled by UAS pilot

Product: Overall con ops, architecture, and roles

CAPABILITY 3: FOCUSES ON HOW TO ENABLE MULTIPLE HETEROGENEOUS OPERATIONS

- Beyond visual line of sight/expanded
- Over moderately populated land
- Some interaction with manned aircraft
- Tracking, V2V, V2UTM and internet connected

Product: Requirements for heterogeneous operations

CAPABILITY 2: DEMONSTRATED HOW TO ENABLE EXPANDED MULTIPLE OPERATIONS

- Beyond visual line-of-sight
- Tracking and low density operations
- Sparsely populated areas
- Procedures and “rules-of-the road”
- Longer range applications

Product: Requirements for multiple BVLOS operations including off-nominal dynamic changes

CAPABILITY 4: FOCUSES ON ENABLING MULTIPLE HETEROGENEOUS HIGH DENSITY URBAN OPERATIONS

- Beyond visual line of sight
- Urban environments, higher density
- Autonomous V2V, internet connected
- Large-scale contingencies mitigation
- Urban use cases

Product: Requirements to manage contingencies in high density, heterogeneous, and constrained operations

Risk-based approach: depends on application and geography

UTM TCL2: Scheduling and Executing Multiple BVLOS Operations



Conflict Alerts

Alert triggered by proximity to other aircraft

Intruder Alerts

Alert triggered from radar submitted warning regions to UTM research prototype

Contingency Alerts


Simulated in-flight emergency reported to the UTM research prototype and relayed to impacted operations

Flight Conformance Alerts

Alert triggered from departing from operational area and relayed to impacted operations

Priority Operations

Users with special privileges are given priority of the airspace and impacted operations are informed of any conflicts



Scheduling and tracking operations and contingency management



FAA-NASA Research Transition Team (RTT) Deliverables

RTT Plan & Key Deliverables



- **Near-term priorities**

- Joint UTM Project Plan (JUMP) – December 2016 (Completed)
- RTT Research plan – January 2017
- UTM Pilot project – April 2017-2019

- **Execution**

- March 2016 – December 2020



- **Key RTT Deliverables (FAA needs)**

- Tech transfer - to FAA and industry
 - Concepts and requirements for data exchange and architecture, communication/navigation and detect/sense and avoid
 - Cloud-based architecture and ConOps
 - Multiple, coordinated UAS BVLOS operations
 - Multiple BVLOS UAS and manned operations
 - Multiple operations in urban airspace
- Tech transfer to FAA
 - Flight Information Management System prototype (software prototype, application protocol interface description, algorithms, functional requirements)

- **FAA-NASA Key RTT Deliverable**

- Joint FAA-NASA UTM Pilot Program

RTT will culminate into key technical transfers to FAA and joint pilot program plan and execution

Partnerships and Collaboration Approach



- FAA and NASA are actively and closely collaborating
 - Over 200 collaborators: Gov't, industry, academia, FAA test sites, and FAA COE
- Industry is settling down: main players in commercial small UAS operators are emerging
- FAA and NASA will continue to collaborate to ensure agility and safety needs are balanced
- Other working groups
 - Information security group being formed
 - Weather group getting focused
 - Spectrum working group collaborating with CTIA

TCL1 & 2 Demo and Preliminary Results

UTM TCL1 and TCL2 Demonstration Objectives

TCL1

Evaluate the feasibility of multiple VLOS operations using scheduling and planning through an API connection to the UTM research platform

TCL2

Evaluate the feasibility of multiple BVLOS operations using a UTM research platform



TCL1: Multiple VLOS Operations

TCL1


August 2015

UAS Range




Elevation: 166 feet MSL

Flat Agricultural Farmland


Operations at 2 Locations




UTM TCL1 Demonstration Highlights



TCL1 Demonstration Objectives



Objective 2: Collect Data on UAS Navigation Performance Error



Objective 4: Collect Weather Observations for Forecasting Models



Objective 1: Demonstrate UTM Prototype Features

Objective 5: Collect Data on Noise Signature of UAS Vehicles



Objective 3: Collect Data on Aircraft Tracking Performance




Flight Profiles:

- Free Flight
- Horizontal Trajectory Conformance
- Vertical Trajectory Conformance
- Sound Recording
- System Identification Maneuvers

Legend

- 5 ADS-B Relay Station
- B Field Operations Canopy
- C Ground Control Station #1
- A Ground Control Station #2
- Latrines
- 4 Microphone
- P Parking
- E Rest Area
- D UTM Canopy
- Video Station





TCL1 Safety-related Observations

Observations:_____

1

Ground equipment degraded performance and failed under high temperatures

High temperatures caused failures in ground control stations, routers, UTM computers, and Ethernet wiring.

2

Spectrum interference from unknown sources causes lost link conditions

Lost link conditions were invoked due to spectrum interference. Local farming equipment was hypothesized to have contributed to the incidents.

3

GPS degradation caused initiation of contingency management system

Inefficient satellites received during operations caused an aircraft to initiate a contingency management procedure and grounded another vehicle.

UAS and ground equipment should be rated for use based on the operational environment

Observations:

4

Atmospheric conditions on the ground were not indicative of conditions aloft

Despite flat terrain, wind and turbulence conditions varied on the ground as compared with 200—400 ft. AGL.

5

Line of sight was often difficult to maintain when flying multiple aircraft

In the presence of other nearby operations, and raptors maintaining visual on aircraft was challenging for observers of the test.

6

Tracking information for UAS was provided at rate that was insufficient

The test used 5 second update rates for telemetry information which did not account for the dynamic changes in aircraft states, dropouts, quality of service connectivity, and human factors aspect of the displays. (Changed for TCL 2: 1 Hz or faster)

7

Lack of airspace and operations information caused conflicting planned operations

Flight crews had no airspace displays to allow them to de-conflict operations and this caused frequent operations that were in conflict.

All airspace users should have a common picture of the operating environment



TCL2: Multiple BVLOS Operations

TCL 2

October 2016

Test Range

Operational Area



UAS Range

Elevation: 5050 feet
Desert Terrain
Missions up to 500 ft.
Operations at 5 Locations

State of Nevada Test Site



Reno



SRHawk Radar

Used to detect small UAS



Weather Equipment

30 ft. weather tower, sodar and lidar are used to measure atmospheric boundary layer



LSTAR Radar

Used to detect manned aircraft

UTM TCL2 Demonstration Flight Operations

Live-Virtual Constructive Environment



Altitude Stratified Operations



Situation Awareness Displays

Critical alerts, operational plan
information and map displays



Expanded

Flights up to 1.5
miles away from the
pilot in command



Visual Line of
Sight


Hypothetical
missions based on
industry use cases



Simultaneous
Operations

	SCENARIO 1 AGRICULTURE	SCENARIO 2 LOST HIKER	SCENARIO 3 OCEAN	SCENARIO 4 EARTHQUAKE
BVLOS	✓	✓	✓	✓
MULTIPLE BVLOS	✓		✓	
ALTITUDE STRATIFIED VLOS	✓	✓		✓
ALTITUDE STRATIFIED BVLOS			✓	
INTRUDER AIRCRAFT TRACKING	✓		✓	
INTRUDER AIRCRAFT CONFLICT ALERTS	✓		✓	
ROGUE AIRCRAFT CONFLICT ALERTS	✓			
DYNAMIC RE- ROUTING		✓		✓
CONTINGENCY MANAGEMENT CONFLICT ALERTS			✓	✓
PUBLIC SAFETY PRIORITY OPERATION		✓		
SIMULATED VIRTUAL AIRCRAFT		✓		✓

Scenario 2: Lost Hiker



Critical Events (in approximate order):

- **GCS1** (submits all plans while logged in as special user
- **GCS3** sends message to RC “Reporting a lost hiker in area...” (*once all GCS have launched*)
- **ALL GCS** receive message from RC “Simulated lost hiker in area...” (*once all GCS have launched*)
- **GCS1** submits 2nd plan with special permissions
*logged in as special user (*after 2 minute hover & lost hiker message*)
- **GCS3** receives UTM system message “first responder in proximity...” and ABORTS (*after GCS1’s 2 min hover & lost hiker message*)
- **GCS5** submits 2nd plan – REJECTED for special permissions operation – does not launch (*after landing plan 1, while GCS1 is still flying*)

GCS 1:	Traffic Monitoring @ 300 ft	Medical Supply Delivery @ 300 ft
GCS 2:	Cell Tower Inspection @ 200 ft	
GCS 3:	Forest Ranger @ 500 ft	
GCS 4:	News Reporter @ 500 ft	
GCS 5:	News Reporter @ 300 ft	

UTM TCL 2 Demonstration Highlights



14

Partner Organizations



2

Simultaneous Altitude Stratified Expanded Operations



11

UAS Platforms



4

Scenarios


74

Flights

13.5

Flight Hours



UTM Research Platform



UTM Core Principles and Guiding Tenet	Tested Feature
UAS should avoid each other	Scheduling and Planning Conformance Alerting Proximity Alerting Separation by Segregation (e.g. Geo-fencing)
UAS should avoid manned aircraft	Intruder Alerting Separation by Notification (e.g. NOTAM)
UAS operators should have complete awareness of all constraints in the airspace	UTM Mobile Application Contingency Management Alerts
Public safety UAS have priority within the airspace	Priority Operations
Flexibility where possible and structure where necessary	Altitude Stratification Dynamic Re-routing 4D Segmented Flight Plans

TCL2 Safety-related Observations

Impact of Weather



Nominal Aircraft Endurance

Multi-Rotors: 20-40 minutes

Fixed-Wing: 45-200+ minutes

Reno-Stead Elevation: 5,050 ft





Cool Temperatures

Density Altitude: 4,000 ft

Winds: 5-35 knots

Aircraft encountered **thermals**, **microbursts** and **high winds** which resulted in **reduced endurance** and degraded flight plan conformance



Warm Temperatures

Density Altitude: 9,000+ ft


Winds: 5-15 knots

Aircraft experienced substantially **shorter endurance**

UAS should be tested and rated against different operational environments

Inconsistent Altitude Reporting

Increased risk of controlled flight into terrain and airborne collision hazard



Altitude Reporting should be consistent or translatable across airspace users


Key Findings using UTM to support Expanded Operations



Manned Aircraft Test Range
Incursion on 10/22/2016

9 Surveillance enhanced situation awareness

Surveillance may not be a requirement in all TCL2 environments, however for areas with increased manned air traffic, surveillance provided increased situation awareness and should be required.



Preliminary Recommendations for Initial Multiple BVLOS Operations

01

Operators need to **display airspace information** and have access to other operator's operational intent and contingency actions in off-nominal conditions



02

In the absence of acceptable weather products, **atmospheric conditions** should be **self-reported** from **GCS** and **UAS**

03

Initial BVLOS should **avoid altitude stratification**, until altitude standard, V2V



04

Altitude reporting should be **standardized** and consistent/translatable to current airspace users



05

Operator training, UTM information integrated with GCS, displaying airspace constraints, and procedural guidance are needed to support **separation provision**



- National UAS Standardized Testing and Rating (NUSTAR)
- Current State of the Art
 - Many performance measures are considered for UAS
 - Capability to assess and certify performance benchmarking is a huge gap
- Proposed Solution
 - Responsible, credible, collaborative tests and data
 - Parallel: Underwriter's Laboratory, Consumer Reports, JD Powers
- Approach
 - Drop tests
 - Urban, rural, atmospheric conditions (e.g., fog, smog, rain, winds)
 - Sense and avoid, Simulated obstructions, GPS denied conditions, etc.
 - Cyber security
- Data oriented rating, acceptance, and assurance
- Every UAS vehicle model goes through
- Support UAS manufacturers, consumers, FAA, insurance companies, and public at large through objective assessments



Summary/Next Steps

Next Steps



- Additional TCL2 multiple BVLOS tests at all FAA test sites
 - Released statement of work recently
- TCL3 preparations ongoing
- Working groups continue: Join the collaborative innovation
- Continue to work closely with FAA on UTM pilot project

QUESTIONS?



Embracing innovation in aviation while respecting its safety tradition

Extension of UAS Traffic Management

